

IN THIS ISSUE

The recent efforts to reach a comprehensive peace accord in Central America have once again focused attention on the region. Nicaragua remains one of the key players in the conflict resolution process, both because of the uncertainty surrounding the U.S.-supported war against the Sandinista regime, and because of the controversy arising from the political process and future inside Nicaragua itself. Roger Hamburg examines the Nicaraguan question through the medium of Soviet foreign policy. He concludes that the Soviet Union will continue to provide military assistance to Nicaragua because of the advantage gained by having a client in that region. He also believes that they will support peace efforts and a dialogue with the regime's opponents, so long as neither threatens to undermine the Sandinista regime.

The inconclusive outcome of the 'Contra War' against the Sandinistas inevitably raises the question of whether the United States can ever win a 'small war.' By examining the historical record against a series of hypotheses, Michael Engelhardt suggests that there are circumstances in which the United States could expect to prevail. While conceding that his analytical framework might be useful in assessing policy options, he urges caution in its application, since every conflict situation is unique.

Frederic Pearson and his colleagues use a similar method to assess the impact of arms transfers on conflicts in Africa. While acknowledging that effects vary with the circumstances, their research offers some interesting conclusions regarding the relationship between arms transfers and intervention, escalation, and embargos.

Finally, Michael Gunter examines the political turmoil in Turkey that precipitated the military takeover in September 1980. He documents the paralysis of the democratic political institutions, the social causes of violent political unrest, and the scale of extremism and violence that preceded the coup. He argues that the extraordinary situation called for extraordinary measures to restore legitimate political authority and stability while asserting that violations of human rights continued longer than was justified by the crisis of 1980.

* * *

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome and introduce four new members of the Editorial Advisory Board. Three of them have written for the journal in recent years, and thus are known to our readers. Abraham H. Miller is Professor of Political Science at the University of Cincinnati. He is well-known and highly regarded for his writing on terrorism, hostage negotiation, and the media. Kenneth G. Robertson is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Reading and is recognized as a leading British specialist in intelligence studies. Harold Dana Sims is Professor of History at the University of Pittsburgh. He brings to the Board a wealth of expertise in Latin American history. An authority on the British experience of insurgency and counter-

insurgency, Charles Townshend, Professor of History at the University of Keele, England, has published extensively on the Irish troubles of the twentieth century. As Executive Editor, I am delighted that they have agreed to serve on the Board. The *Quarterly* will, I am certain, benefit greatly from their counsel and assistance.

The opinions expressed in the articles, reviews and other contributions are those of the authors alone, and do not necessarily represent those of the Centre for Conflict Studies or of the University of New Brunswick.
